

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 4-21 remain pending in the application, with claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 15 and 18 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 15 and 18 are sought to be amended. Claim 3 is sought to be canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of its subject matter. Entry and consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. No new matter is believed to have been introduced by this amendment.

Applicants have made the above amendment to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding objections and rejections.

***Objection to Claim 12***

Claim 12 is objected to because of informalities. In the Preliminary Amendment filed in the instant application, the label of claim 12 should have been changed from "Original" to "Currently Amended." Applicants currently list the label of claim 12 as "Currently Amended". Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to claim 12.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0143529 (hereinafter referred to as "Schmid") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,708,885 (hereinafter referred to as "Beutnagel"). Applicants respectfully

traverse this rejection since Schmid and Beutnagel, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each element of independent claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 15 and 18 and their respective dependent claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 19-21 for at least the following reason.

Independent claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 15 and 18 include a similar feature of: wherein the non-generic words are not part of the rule-based grammar, assigning each of the generic and non-generic words a confidence level based on a set of rules followed by the speech engine, removing the generic words from the set of potential words spoken by the user, and selecting a remaining non-generic word from the set of potential words spoken by the user having a highest confidence level. The Examiner states that Schmid lacks this feature of the claimed invention and points to Beutnagel to show this feature. Applicants respectfully assert that Beutnagel does not teach or suggest this feature of the claimed invention. For example, the Examiner points to Beutnagel (col. 6, lines 20-30 - return the "N" most likely members of the recognition grammar) to show the claimed feature of removing the generic words from the set of potential words spoken by the user and wherein the remaining word is a non-generic word. Applicants respectfully assert that the "return the 'N' most likely members of the recognition grammar" language of Beutnagel does not make a distinction between generic and non-generic words, as does the claimed invention. For at least this reason, independent claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 15 and 18 and their respective dependent claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 19-21 are distinguishable from Schmid and Beutnagel, either taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**INVITATION FOR A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW**

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned, Molly A. McCall, at (703) 633-3311 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Thus, Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and allowance of this application.


Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Dated: November 1, 2005

/Molly A. McCall/ Registration No. 46,126  
Molly A. McCall  
(703) 633-3311

P10364 response to second non-final OA

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:	
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	
On: <u>November 1, 2005</u>	
Signature: Katherine Jennings	